IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 1011

International Court of Justice

Com. B
Take 4 - P. 1
Roberts
4 July 1946
1540 - 1705
Dr. Hans Roessner

1705-1

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPO INTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNA L PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

H1011-0002

4 July 1946

COMMISSIONER:

MARTIN-HARVARD ARMAND

SD

POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

(The Commission convened at 1540 hours)

Dr. HANS ROESSNER, a witness, took the stand, was sworn in, and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q. I want to prove by interrogation of the witness, Dr. Hans Roessner, that the activity of Group III C cannot be considered as support and joining a conspiracy and that this group did not commit any crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity. I want to prove it by the witness having the necessary knowledge of the facts pertinent to the proof. Dr. Roessner since when were you a member of the SD?

A. In 1934 to 1936 I was active in the SD, partly voluntary, which is to say without pay, and partly as a part time paid employee. As scientific assistant of the Freiburg University I was drafted into section 3 of the RSHA in 1940 as an emergency measure.

Q. What was your function in the SD?

A. I dealt with matters pertaining to science, education, religious life, art, and general cultural questions.

Q. What was your rank as SS Fuehrer?

H1011 - 0003

A. Corresponding to my position as Department Chief I was at the end an SS Obersturmbann Fuhrer.

Q. Were you a party member?

A. Yes I joined the party in 1937.

Q. In what section of AMT 3 were you occupied?

A. Group III C.

Q. My next q uestions will serve to prove that the aims, activities and tasks of Group III C did not constitute assistance or furtherance of crimes against peace, war crimes or crimes against humanity. What was the organization of Group III C in 1939 until the end of the war?

A. Group III C was organized in six sections: Group III C-1, Science and Universities; III C-2, Education and Religious Life; III C-3, Peoples Culture and Art; III C-4, P ress, Publications and Radio; III C-5, Cultural situation in occupied territories; III C-6, was called Lektorat, an office in which they evaluated for the AMT 3, the writing of documents.

Q. Will you give us a brief description of the tasks and aims of Group III C?

A. Group III C had the task of measuring intelligence and information pertaining to misdirected cultural appearances and appearances in the cultural life which may have been harmful to the German people and to inform them about that. For instance pertaining to the spheres of Science, Religious Life and Propaganda, Group III C had to gather all information pertaining to critical voices emanating from the people and professional letters and make reports of them.

Q. Were all members of the group made acquainted with the tasks and goals?

A. Yes, all tasks and goals were made known to the members of the group.

Q. Was there any difference between these tasks and goals and other tasks and goals of Group AMT 3?

H1011 - 0004

A. No,Group III also like the other groups of their AMT 3 was organized in politically mutual election groups. This as also other groups of AMT 3 did not have any executive authority.

Q. For what purpose were these reports collected?

A. Group III intended to produce and picture as completely as possible all of appearances and misdirections in cultural spheres. The main thing was to collect critical voices which emanated from the people and also constructive suggestions.

Q. Who were these critical voices to be reported to?

A. These critical voices were summarized in reports, or they were transferred as individual reports to the competent offices of the party or the State.

Q. Were the members of Group III C aware that the lea ders of the State and the Party were conspiring in a plan to commit crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity?

A. No, members of Group III C were not aware of it. If such a thing would have been known I in my capacity as Chief of Group III C would certainly have been aware of it. Unified and communal leadership in the cultural sphere was not extant either in the party or the State sector. The picture however showed a controversial mix-up of power groups and internal groups.

Q. The instruction of the leadership of the Party of the SD, did it have for its purpose to support conspirators in the plan of the just mentioned crimes?

A. No, the SD interior AMT 3 has never pursued such a purpose. It never received any assignments in that sanse neither from the SS or from any other authority.

Q. For what purpose were the leading authorities of the State and Party informed by the SD?

H1011 - 0005

A. It was the purpose of Group III C to achieve a clear picture regarding the cultural situation by way of the Intelligence Service. It did not consider its intelligence service task by way of a goal set by either the State or the Party but it attempted to create a picture of the real situation objectively and without prejudice which prevailed culturally in the German people.

Q. Will you briefly describe the activities of the Group III C-1?

A. The activity and goal of the section III C-1 consisted of collecting criticism from scientific circles pertaining to the development and misdirection, also suggestions and to inform the competent Ministry of the facts.

Q. Did Referat III C-1 send reports on lecturers at universities?

A. Referat III C-1 made personal reports.

Q. To whom?

A. Substantially to the Reich Education Ministry, the Party Chancellor, and the Dozentenbund.

Q. What were these personal reports?

A . Department III C-1 tried to give an/extensive total picture as possible of the scientific personalities.

Q. Will you give us an example?

A . Yes, if for instance a university intended to appoint a lecturer or a professor, this university then reported a suggestion for an appointment to the Reich Education Ministry. The Reich Education Ministry inquired at the party chancellory about the attitude. The party chancellory asked for political guidance of the Gau leader and asked each day for information pertaining to its scientific personalities. With this total evaluation the SD was not permitted to enter any political evaluation, only the political Hoheitstrager was competent to do so.

Q. What was the purpose of these personal reports of Department III C-1?

H1011 - 0006

A. The information given by the SD represented a supplement in addition to the political evaluation by the Hoheitstrager; in addition to the expert opinion delivered by the Ministry and the Dozentenbund. The SD wanted to give a total picture without being influenced by the interests of groups or cliques.

Q. Was it the purpose of these reports to bring people into positions where they would not resist any plan to bring about crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity?

A. No, such a goal has never been set, neither had it set the task by itself. The supreme goal of Group III C was to bring the proper professional q ualified person into the right position.

Q. Was appointment and promotion of lecturers and universsity professors influenced substantially by the reports emanating from the AMT?

A. No, the personal reports of Group III C did not have any importance or inference, they were merely information.

Q. Who appointed and promoted the lecturers?

A.- The Reich Ministry for Education cooperating with the party chancellory.

Q. I will show an essay by Prof. Doctor Gerhard Ritter from the publication DOK. SD 1, dated 24 December 1945, entitled the "German Professor in the Third Reich". The number of this document is SD-1.

LT COMDR HARRIS: Has this document been introduced before or are you introducing it now?

DR. GAWLIK: I am introducing it now.

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you only referring to this document or do you put it in.

DR. GAWLIK: I have several questions regarding it. I will not ask any questions as far as the document speaks for itself. I want to prove that the situation which Dr. Ritter describes in a magazine published

H1011 - 0007

in December 1945 is typical for the activity of the SD.

COL. ORLOV: It is not a document. It is an article that appeared at the time the Tribunal was in existence and working already. The Tribunal has indicated that material published after the 20th of November is not acceptable as evidence.

LT COMDR HARRIS: I join in the objection.

THE COMMISSIONER: We consider it as not being enterable at this time as a document, but you may ask q uestions concerning it.

BY THE DEFENSE:

Q. Witness, do you know who Dr. Gerhard Ritter is?

A. Dr. Ritter is one of the best known German historians, he is from the University of Freiburg. Prof. Ritter has a p ronunced anti-Nazi attitude and he has again and again exhibited his hostile attitude toward the Nazi.

Q. Prof. Ritter in this article writes:

LT COMDR HARRIS: I object upon the grounds as stated by my Russian colleague. Prof. Ritter is not here on the stand to testify and we can not cross examine him. What he has said was not said under oath. It is something which he said after the Tribunal commenced its deliberations and therefore I think it irrelevant and improper to appear in the record as statements made by him in this article.

BY THE COMMISSIONER: If there is no question of referring to this document he may use it as a guide and he can ask questions to acquaint the witness. You can ask the witness if he agrees to that document but you must not read from the document.

DR. GAWLIK: I believe that the objections of Lt Comdr Harris are without foundation because the prosecution has submitted many books,

H1011 - 0008

among them the book by Best, speeches by Himmler Heidrich. I'd appreciate a ruling. I should like to have a ruling of the comments that these are also private publications.

THE COMMISSIONER: The documents introduced by the prosecution were documents dating from before the Tribunal deliberated.

DR. GAWLIK: I do not see why documents published after the beginning of the trial should be of less evidence than the documents which were published even during war time. I should suggest that documents published after the war have a greater power of evidence than those published during the war.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is no one here competent to rule on this and as there is a question of discussion on this document, I can only advise you to make your request at the Tribunal as is usually done. Without quoting any extracts from the document, you can ask questions of the witness. We can not take into consideration Dr. Ritter's statements.

MR. MONNERAY: I think the defense counsel does not quite understand the proposal of the Commissioner so I think what the Commissioner is proposing is that you just ask the witness for instance is it correct that Prof. Ritter was under the control of the SD for quite a long time, etc.

COL ORLOV: A brief remark. At the interrogations of Schirach the International Military Tribunal stated has submitted such an article, such a newspaper, and the German has ruled that such newspaper can not be used as evidence for an exhibit.

THE COMMISSIONER: The commissioner has already said that this question was settled and it has refused that the document should be accepted and suggested to the counsel to ask the Tribunal in writing if it could be utilized.

H1011 - 0009

(DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED)

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q. Do you know whether Dr. Ritter was arrested by the Gestapo?

A. If memory serves right, at a later point Ritter was arrested.

Q. Do you know the reasons for the arrest of Dr. Ritter?

A. As far as I remember, it wa s in connection with the attack on Hitler.

Q. Do you know whether the reasons for his arrest were remarks made by Dr. Ritter in writing, in his publications?

A. Dr. Ritter in his articles mentions himself that the Intelligence Service records were not transferred to the Gestapo.

THE COMMISSIONER: The Commission does not wish to hear any more about Dr. Ritter. Put your questions direct to the witness concerning what you want to prove.

DR. GAWLIK: You just have ruled that I may ask questions from the article but that I am not permitted to read the article. I have asked factual questions and I wish to prove that this is typical SD work which is shown here.

THE COMMISSIONER: You have not understood what you can do. You may state direct questions. For instance, you can ask him for such and such a point. We have not the time to go into detail.

MR. MONNERAY: The Commissioner does not think it is relevant to talk about Dr. Ritter.

DR. GAWLIK: I am sa ying that I am not interested in the individual case of Dr. Ritter, but I want to prove by this witness that the case of Ritter is typical of the work in the SD.

H1011-0010

LT COMDR HARRIS: If it would help expedite proceedings, since it is a comparatively unimportant p oint I am willing to withdraw my objection and let him put in the whole thing to save time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Continue.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q. Was the SD acquainted with the Anti-Nazi attitude of Dr. Ritter as it could be seen from his lectures and publications?

A. Yes, the SD was acquainted with the attitude of Dr. Ritter by the reports it received and also of the attitude and morale of students at Freiburg University.

Q. After the American prosecutor has withdrawn his objection, I believe the following question is admissible. Dr. Ritter writes in this article that he was astonished during his interrogation by the Gestapo that the material about him concerning his hostile attitude toward the Nazi which was well known was not even submitted or used. What do you know about that?

A. THe SD AMT 3 was not an Intelligence assistance service for the Gestapo, particularly it was not within its scope to pick up individual cases and to report on them. A nd in so far the case of Ritter is a typ ical example of the work of Group III C.

Q. Dr. Ritter further writes of the anti-Nazi attitude at Freiburg University. What do you know about that?

A. Referat III C-1 knew about this anti-Nazi attitude of students and teaching bodies not only in the University of Freiburg but in other universities.

Q. How did you hear about that?

A. Through the usual report channels of subordinates officers.

Q. What was initiated on the basis of that?

A. Like in all other cases the reports were not transferred to AMT 4 of the Gestapo but was repeated in the summary, that is was summarized and reported

H1011-0011

to the Reichstudentenbund and the Reichstudentbund reported with the remark that this attitude and morale of the students should be understood to be a genuine student position as it was customary at all times with students, but that it would be very mistaken to criticize this desire for discussion and expression as political hostility and to interfere here with police.

Q. Was treatment of the case of Dr. Ritter and the University of Freiburg a special case or was that the general manner in which such things were handled?

A. No, the material reported from Freiburg and the use of it is an absolutely typical example. AMT 3 has formulated and sent out many similar reports. The tendency and the attitude taken in the report was the same as described by me just now.

Q. I now come to the next point -- the aims, goals and activities of Group III C-2. In connection with that I want to prove that it was not one of the aims of SD to persecute the churches. Could you give us a brief description and the goals of Referat III C-2.

A. The Referat III C-2 had for its task to acquire information regarding appearances and misdirections, criticisms and also positive suggestions pertaining to educational and religious questions.

Q. Did any other department of AMT 3 since the establishment of the RSHA treat with religious or educational problems?

A. No, problems pertaining to the religious life also were dealt with in Group III C-2. Later on there was a reorganization without any reason and after because of this reorganization it was department III C-3 which dealt with these religious questions during the last year.

Q. Will you describe briefly the manner in which religious and educational matters were dealt with?

H1011 - 0012

A. I wish to state that since the establishment of AMT 3 no church problems were dealt with in AMT 3.

THE COMMISSIONER: We will recess until tomorrow morning at 1000 hours.

(Commission recessed at 1705 hours)

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of Dr. Hans Roessner, taken on 4 July 1946.

Evelyn M. Roberts
Reporter (pp.

CERTIFIED TO:

A. Martin-Harvard.
Commissioner

H1011-0013

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

4 July 1946.

COMMISSIONER:

MARTIN-HARVARD ARMAND

S.D.

(THE COMMISSION CONVENED AT 1540 HOURS.)

DR. HANS ROESSNER, a witness, took the stand, was sworn in, and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q I want to prove by interrogation of the witness, Dr. Hans Roessner, that the activity of Group III C cannot be considered as support and joining a conspiracy and that this group did not commit any crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity. I want to prove it by the witness having the necessary knowledge of the facts pertinent to the proof. Dr. Roessner, since when were you a member of the SD?

A In 1934 to 1936 I was active in the SD, partly voluntary, which is to say without pay, and partly as a part time paid employee. As scientific assistant of the Freiburg University I was drafted into section 3 of the RSHA in 1940 as an emergency measure.

Q What was your function in the SD?

A I dealt with matters pertaining to science, education, religious life, art, and general cultural questions.

Q What was your rank as SS Fuehrer?

A Corresponding to my position as Department Chief I was at the end an SS Obersturmbann Fuehrer.

Q Were you a party member?

A Yes, I joined the party in 1937.

Q In what section of Amt 3 were you occupied?

A Group III C.

Q My next questions will serve to prove that aims, activities and tasks of Group III C did not constitute assistance or furtherance of crimes

H1011-0014

against peace, war crimes or crimes against humanity. What was the organization of Group III C in 1939 until the end of the war?

A Group III C was organized in six sections: Group III C-1, Science and Universities; III C-2, Education and Religious Life; III C-3, Peoples Culture and Art; III C-4, Press, publications and Radio; III C-5, Cultural situation in occupied territories; III C-6, was called Lektorat, an office in which they evaluated for the Amt 3, the writing of documents.

Q Will you give us a brief description of the tasks and aims of Group III C?

A Group III C had the task of measuring intelligence and information pertaining to misdirected cultural appearances and appearances in the cultural life which may have been harmful to the German people and to inform them about that. For instance pertaining to the spheres of Science, Religious Life and Propaganda, Group III C had to gather all information pertaining to critical voices emanating from the people and professional letters and make reports of them.

Q Were all members of the group made acquainted with the tasks and goals?

A Yes, all tasks and goals were made known to the members of the group.

Q Was there any difference between these tasks and goals and other tasks and goals of Group Amt 3?

A No, Group III also like the other groups of their Amt 3 was organized in politically mutual election groups. This as also other groups of Amt 3 did not have any executive authority.

Q For what purpose were these reports collected?

A Group III intended to produce and picture as completely as possible all of appearances and misdirections in cultural spheres. The main thing was to collect critical voices which emanated from the people and also constructive suggestions.

Q Who were these critical voices to be reported to?

A These critical voices were summarized in reports, or they were transferred as individual reports to the competent offices of the party or the State.

H1011 - 0015

Q Were the members of Group III C aware that the leaders of the State and the Party were conspiring in a plan to commit crimes against peace, war crimes and crimes against humanity?

A No, members of Group III C were not aware of it. If such a thing would have been known I in my capacity as Chief of Group III C would certainly have been aware of it. Unified and communal leadership in the cultural sphere was not extant either in the party or the State sector. The picture, however, showed a controversial mix-up of power groups and internal groups.

Q The instruction of the leadership of the Party of the SD, did it have for its purpose to support conspirators in the plan of the just mentioned crimes?

A No, the SD interior Amt 3 has never pursued such a purpose. It never received any assignments in that sense neither from the SS or from any other authority.

Q For what purpose were the leading authorities of the State and Party informed by the SD?

A It was the purpose of Group III C to achieve a clear picture regarding the cultural situation by way of the Intelligence Service. It did not consider its intelligence service task by way of a goal set by either the State or the Party but it attempted to create a picture of the real situation objectively and without prejudice which prevailed culturally in the German people.

Q Will you briefly describe the activities of the Group III C-1?

A The activity and goal of the section III C-1 consisted of collecting criticism from scientific circles pertaining to the development and misdirection, also suggestions and to inform the competent Ministry of the facts.

Q Did Referat III C-1 send reports on lecturers at universities?

A Referat III C-1 made personal reports.

Q To whom?

A Substantially to the Reich Education Ministry, the Party Chancellor, and the Dozentenbund.

Q What were these personal reports?

A Department III C-1 tried to give an extensive total picture

H1011-0016

as possible of the scientific personalities.

Q Will you give us an example?

A Yes, if for instance a university intended to appoint a lecturer or a professor, this university then reported a suggestion for an appointment to the Reich Education Ministry. The Reich Education Ministry inquired at the party chancellory about the attitude. The party chancellory asked for political guidance of the Gau leader and asked each day for informatic pertaining to its scientific personalities. With this total evaluation the SD was not permitted to enter any political evaluation, only the political Hoheitstrager was competent to do so.

Q What was the purpose of these personal reports of Department III C-1?

A The information given by the SD represented a supplement in addition to the political evaluation by the Hoheitstrager; in addition to the expert opinion delivered by the Ministry and the Dozentenbund. The SD wanted to give a total picture without being influenced by the interests of groups or cliques.

Q Was it the purpose of these reports to bring people into positions where they would not resist any plan to bring about crimes against peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity?

A No, such a goal has never been set, neither had it set the task by itself. The supreme goal of Group III C was to bring the proper professional qualified person into the right position.

Q Was appointment and promotion of lecturers and university professors influenced substantially by the reports emanating from the Amt?

A No, the personal reports of Group III C did not have any importance or inference, they were merely information.

Q Who appointed and promoted the lecturers?

A The Reich Ministry for Education cooperating with the Party Chancellory.

Q I will show an essay by Prof. Doctor Verhard Ritter from the publication DOK. SD 1, dated 24 December 1945, entitled the "German Professor in the Third Reich." The number of this document SD-1.

LT. COMDR. HARRIS: Has this document been introduced before or are you introducing it now?

H1011 - 0017

THE COMMISSIONER: Are you only referring to this document or do you put it in.

DR. GAWLIK: I have several questions regarding it. I will not ask any questions as far as the document speaks for itself. I want to prove that the situation which Dr. Riter describes in a magazine published in December 1945 is typical for the activity of the SD.

COL. ORLOV: It is not a document. It is an article that appeared at the time the Tribunal was in existence and working already. The Tribunal has indicated that material published after the 20th of November is not acceptable as evidence.

LT. COMDR. HARRIS: I join in the objection.

THE COMMISSIONER: We consider it as not being enterable at this time as a document, but you may ask questions concerning it.

BY THE DEFENSE:

Q Witness, do you know who Dr. Gerhard Ritter is?

A Dr. Ritter is one of the best known German historians, he is from the University of Freiburg. Prof. Ritter has a pronounced anti-Nazi attitude and he has again and again exhibited his hostile attitude ward the Nazi.

Q Prof. Ritter in this article writes:

LT. COMDR: HARRIS: I object upon the grounds as stated by my Russian colleague. Prof. Ritter is not here on the stand to testify and we cannot cross-examine him. What he has said was not said under oath. It is something which he said after the Tribunal commenced its deliberations and therefore I think it irrelevant and improper to appear in the record as statements made by him in this article.

BY THE COMMISSIONER: If there is no question of referring to this document he may use it as a guide and he can ask questions to acquaint the witness. You can ask the witness if he agrees to that document but you must not read from the document.

DR. GAWLIK: I believe that the objections of Lt. Comdr. Harris are without foundation because the prosecution has submitted many books,

H1011 -0018

among them the book by Dost, speeches by Himmler Heidrich. I'd appreciate a ruling. I should like to have a ruling of the comments that these are also private publications.

THE COMMISSIONER: The documents introduced by the prosecution were documents dating from before the Tribunal deliberated.

DR. GAULIK: I do not see why documents published after the beginning of the trial should be of less evidence than the documents which were published even during war time. I should suggest that documents published after the war have a greater power of evidence than those published during the war.

THE COMMISSIONER: There is no one here competent to rule on this and as there is a question of discussion on this document, I can only advise you to make your request at the Tribunal as is usually done. Without quoting any extracts from the document, you can ask questions of the witness. We cannot take into consideration Dr. Ritter's statements.

MR. MONTGOMERY: I think the defense counsel does not quite understand the proposal of the Commissioner so I think what the Commissioner is proposing is that you just ask the witness for instance is it correct that Prof. Ritter was under the control of the SD for quite a long time, etc.

COL. ORLOV: A brief remark. At the interrogation of Schirach the International Military Tribunal stated has submitted such an article, such a newspaper, and the German has tuled that such newspaper cannot be used as evidence for an exhibit.

THE COMMISSIONER: The commissioner has already said that this question was settled and it has refused that the document should be accepted and suggested to the counsel to ask the Tribunal in writing if it could be utilised.

(DIRECT EXAMINATION CONTINUED)

BY DR. GAULIK:

Q Do you know whether Dr. Ritter was arrested by the Gestapo?

A If memory serves right, at a later point Ritter was arrested.

Q Do you know the reasons for the arrest of Dr. Ritter?

A As far as I remember, it was in connection with the attack on Hitler.

Q Do you know whether the reasons for his arrest were remarks made by

H1011-0019

Dr. Ritter in writing, in his publications?

A Dr. Ritter in his articles mentions himself that the Intelligence Service records were not transferred to the Gestapo.

THE COMMISSIONER: The Commission does not wish to hear any more about Dr. Ritter. Put your questions direct to the witness concerning what you want to prove.

DR. GAWLIK: You just have ruled that I may ask questions from the article but that I am not permitted to read the article. I have asked factual questions and I wish to prove that this is typical SD work which is shown here.

THE COMMISSIONER: You have not understood what you can do. You may state direct questions. For instance, you can ask him for such and such a point. We have not the time to go into detail.

MR. MONNERAY: The Commissioner does not think it is relevant to talk about Dr. Ritter.

DR. GAWLIK: I am saying that I am not interested in the individual case of Dr. Ritter, but I want to prove by this witness that the case of Ritter is typical of the work in the SD.

LT. COMDR. HARRIS: If it would help expedite proceedings, since it is a comparatively unimportant point I am willing to withdraw my objection and let him put in the whole thing to save time.

THE COMMISSIONER: Continue.

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Was the SD acquainted with the Anti-Nazi attitude of Dr. Ritter as it could be seen from his lectures and publications?

A Yes, the SD was acquainted with the attitude of Dr. Ritter by the reports it received and also of the attitude and morale of students at Freiburg University.

Q After the American prosecutor has withdrawn his objection, I believe the following question is admissible. Dr. Ritter writes in this article that he was astonished during his interrogation by the Gestapo that the material about him concerning his hostile attitude toward the Nazis which was well known was not even submitted or used. What do you know about that?

A The SD Amt 3 was not an Intelligence assistance service for the Gestapo, particularly it was not within its scope to pick up individual

H1011-0020

cases and to report on them. And in so far the case of Ritter is a typical example of the work of Group III C.

Q Dr. Ritter further writes of the anti-Nazi attitude at Freiburg University. What do you know about that?

A Referat III C-1 know about this anti-Nazi attitude of students and teaching bodies not only in the University of Freiburg but in other universities.

Q How did you hear about that?

A Through the usual report channels of subordinate officers.

Q What was initiated on the basis of that?

A Like in all other cases the reports were not transferred to Amt 4 of the Gestapo but was repeated in the summary, that is was summarized and reported to the Reichstudentenbund and the Reichstudentbund reported with the remark that this attitude and morale of the students should be understood to be a genuine student position as it was customary at all times with students, but that it would be very mistaken to criticize this desire for discussion and expression as political hostility and to interfere here with police.

Q Was treatment of the case of Dr. Ritter and the University of Freiburg a special case or was that the general manner in which such things were handled?

A No, the material reported from Freiburg and the use of it is an absolutely typical example. Amt 3 has formulated and sent out many similar reports. The tendency and the attitude taken in the report was the same as described by me just now.

Q I now come to the next point -- the aims, goals and activities of Group III B-2. In connection with that I want to prove that it was not one of the aims of SD to persecute the churches. Could you give us a brief description and the goals of Referat III C-2.

A The Referat III C-2 had for its task to acquire information regarding appearances and misdirections, criticisms and also positive suggestions pertaining to educational and religious questions.

Q Did any other department of Amt 3 since the establishment of the RSHA treat with religious or educational problems?

H1011 - 0021

A No, problems pertaining to the religious life also were dealt with in Group III C-2. Later on there was a reorganization without any reason and after because of this reorganization it was department III C-3 which dealt with these religious questions during the last year.

Q Will you describe briefly the manner in which religious and educational matters were dealt with?

A I wish to state that since the establishment of Amt 3 no church problems were dealt with in Amt 3.

THE COMMISSIONER: We will recess until tomorrow morning at 1000 hours.

(Commission recessed at 1705 hours).

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of Dr. Hans Roessner, taken on 4 July 1946.

Evelyn M. Roberts
Reporter.

CERTIFIED TO:

A.Martin-Havard
Commissioner